

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, DC 20554**

**In the Matter of:**

|  |   |                             |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>Carrier Current Systems, including Broadband over</b> | ) |                             |
| <b>Power Line Systems</b>                                | ) | <b>ET Docket No. 03-104</b> |
|  | ) |                             |
| <b>Amendment of Part 15 regarding new requirements</b>   | ) |                             |
| <b>and measurement guidelines for Access Broadband</b>   | ) | <b>ET Docket No. 04-37</b>  |
| <b>over Power Line Systems</b>                           | ) |                             |

**To: The Commission**

**REPLY COMMENTS OF THE HILL COUNTRY AMATEUR RADIO  
CLUB**

The Hill Country Amateur Radio Club (HCARC) offers these Reply comments in this Proceeding. HCARC was one of the many filing individual and organizations comments in this Proceeding.

1. HCARC has examined many of the comments filed with the Commission and observed that tests conducted at various Access BPL test sites have clearly shown that the emissions are strong enough to cause major interference to amateur stations, and others using the HF spectrum. HCARC particularly calls the Commission's attention to the comments filed by Mr. Carl R. Stevenson as well as those by ARRL. Mr. Stevenson's comments include test results, not merely statements of "trust us" as do the comments submitter by Access BPL proponents. This is difficult to believe, retrace in light of the lack of attention power

companies give to noise generated by their lines. A number of our members, here in the Kerrville, Texas area, are plagued with such high power line noise levels.

2. In spite of data from actual tests, some of those proposing BPL, such as Progress Energy (Progress) claim that "the interference potential of Access BPL is marginal, though it admits that it has received several complaints of what it terms, "alleged harmful interference from amateur radio operators (hams)". Nevertheless, Progress dismisses such complaints since, according to them, "those who have submitted complaints about Progress Energy's BPL system, intentionally seek out interference using very sophisticated and sensitive equipment." Are we hams and other radio users are supposed to use inferior equipment, so we can't hear Access BPL interference? Another admission of interference from Access BPL systems comes from Ambient Corporation (Ambient). Ambient claims that "under the Commission's policies, 'a certain amount of interference between devices is acceptable; however, beyond a certain limit interference can be considered harmful.'" Ambient requests that the Commission set the boundaries for what is considered "harmful interference, so, that there is a realistic opportunity for the early deployment of BPL technologies..." They are trying to tell the Commission that it should define "harmful interference" so as to allow Access BPL regardless of the harm it will cause.. HCARC suggests that "harmful interference" is any interference strong enough to prevent reception of signals which would have been receivable without the interference. Therefore, HCARC believes that interference should be based on what it does, NOT on some arbitrary number. Thus, if Access BPL keeps

someone, a ham, or some other radio user, from receiving signals they might have received without it, it is causing “harmful interference”; and should not be allowed. We believe that this is what the Part 15 rules say. FCC should follow its own rules.

3. Some of those proposing Access BPL claim that their systems will prevent interference by use of “adaptive features”. They say that such features will “mitigate interference to amateurs by shifting frequency when an amateur signal is detected.” HCARC rejects such arguments. It should be pointed out that, many amateurs spend a great deal of time merely listening, monitoring a particular frequency. How can an Access BPL system detect the fact that an amateur is listening? It’s obvious that it can’t. Thus, it will continue to operate and cause interference.
4. HCARC cites the fact that it isn’t only amateur radio operators who are objecting to Access BPL. Several non-amateur organizations, including Boeing, Aeronautical Radio Incorporated (ARINC), the Association of Maximum Service Television (MSTV), the Society of Amateur Radio Astronomers (SARA), Ship Com, LLC, even NTIA, have filed comments urging that Access BPL not be allowed to use their particular slices of the airwaves. Others, like the Association of Public Safety Communications Officials-International Inc. (APCO), the Missouri State Highway Patrol, and even FEMA, argue for “not in our backyard”. With all of these notches, will Access BPL even work? . Even if the Commission decides to ignore the thousands of comments from hams, HCARC cannot imagine

that it will not heed the concerns, regarding Access BPL, of all the other various users of the HF spectrum, many of which perform vital services

5. For the reasons stated, HCARC urges the Commission to consider carefully all of the comments received. Further, we advise no action to allow installation of Access BPL systems, except at controlled locations for the purpose of thoroughly evaluating the technology's interference potential

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Phillip Barnes, KB5UF

President/Hill Country Amateur Radio Club (HCARC)

430 Johnson Drive

Kerrville, TX 78028

E-mail: pbarnes@omniglobal.net

June 22, 2004